



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

bridged edition contains twenty-one chapters, the student's edition nineteen; the original four chapters on the *Sonne's* are replaced by two, though but little is omitted. With these exceptions the Student's Edition retains the same chapter and paragraph headings, and the Index at the back shows hardly the change of a word. Wider research has not induced the author to modify any of the views formerly enounced, though I notice the negligible change of date for Elizabeth's death from March 26, 1693, to March 24, and the misprint *inued* for *imbued* (p. 46, l. 25).

On p. 94 it seems to be a purely gratuitous insinuation, in view of the lack of evidence either way, that the Shakespeares perpetrated a deliberate lie to secure the coat of arms:

"This allegation [that a former armorial coat had been obtained in 1568] is not noticed in the records of the college, and may be a formal fiction designed by John Shakespeare and his son to recommend their claim to the notice of the heralds in 1596."

The anecdote of Shakespeare, Burbage, William the Conqueror, and "a lady in the audience" is necessarily so emasculated in the telling (p. 139) as to suggest the propriety of omitting it entirely, at least from the Student's Edition.

I hope soon to endeavor to show that Shakespeare commentators have hitherto greatly understated the number and apparent aimlessness of the differences between the Shakesperian Folios, especially between the First Folio and the Second. Mr. Lee affirms (p. 173) that

"The Second Folio was reprinted from the First; a few corrections were made in the text, but most of the changes were arbitrary and needless."

Needless they may have been, but not arbitrary, the syntax of the First Folio being to that of the Second as spoken speech is to written.

In the Appendix (p. 205) Franz's *Shakespeare-Grammatik* should be mentioned beside Abbott's *Shakespearian Grammar*.

As in the larger edition, so here the author eschews merely æsthetic criticism, thus rendering the change of title somewhat misleading; but the facts are stated so clearly, the deductions are based on such sane con-

siderations drawn from so wide a field of investigation and presented in so pleasing a style that the book must meet with a hearty welcome in our colleges and universities. I venture to say that even a cursory reading of this little volume by a student just entering upon the serious study of Shakespeare will give him a better idea of the problems that confront Shakespeare scholarship as well as of the attitude and method necessary for their solution than the reading of any other single volume of equal compass. It will at least impress the salutary lesson that patient and protracted investigation hath its victories no less renowned and certainly more abiding than those of brilliant conjecture and specious generalization.

C. ALPHONSO SMITH.

*University of Paris.*

#### THE MÆDÆVAL EPIC.

*Zu den Kunstformen des mittelalterlichen Epos* (Hartmann's "*Iwein*," *Das Nibelungenlied*, Boccaccio's "*Filostrato*" und Chaucer's "*Troilus und Cryseyde*," Von RUDOLPH FISCHER. Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, IX. Wien u. Leipzig: W. Braumüller, 1899. xviii + 370 pp.

PROFESSOR FISCHER'S work is an attempt to gain criteria for the study of the epic by separating it, in a somewhat anatomical manner, into divisions and subdivisions. These are grouped under various categories, and deductions are drawn from the preponderance of now one and then another category. The author demonstrates his method by application to Hartmann's *Iwein*, and the results thus gained are made use of in the examination of the other poems under consideration. *Iwein* is divided into three parts, not taking into account the prologue (thirty lines) and the epilogue (seven lines). In the first part (ll. 31-2445) the hero sets out on his search for adventure and glory, and finds love. In the second part (ll. 2446-5563) he loses his lady, towards whom he has outwardly broken faith in his desire for adventure, and as an unknown knight regains her respect. In the third part (ll. 5564-8159), after further glorious adventures, he succeeds in bringing about a complete reconciliation. These three main parts con-

stitute, according to Fischer, practically independent stories which are connected only by the circumstance that the chief characters are identical in all.

Each of these divisions has an initial impulse, *ein erregendes Moment*, which starts the action. In the first part it is the tale of Kalogreant concerning his adventure with King Ascalon; in the second it is the admonition of Gawein; in the third, the strife of the two sisters. The remainder of each part, with the exception of the first, is then divided into a number of distinct sections (*Abschnitte*). The second part has four of these, the third part has two.

The smallest sub-divisions into which the author divides the poem are called 'pictures' (*Bilder*), which might be considered as corresponding to the scenes of a drama. Of these there are seventy-nine in the poem. By way of illustration, it may be stated that the first 'picture' extends from l. 31 to l. 85, the second from l. 86 to l. 878, the third from l. 879 to l. 944. Two portions, ll. 2971-3028 and 7015-7074, are left out of consideration as being inorganic interpolations. The 'pictures' vary in length from fifteen lines to seven hundred and ninety-three lines, and it is evident that other critics might subdivide some of the longer ones, and amalgamate some of the shorter ones. But even accepting the author's grouping, his conclusions are not always warranted.

The poem is further divided as to contents into two elementary parts: I, psychological, which is identical with the first of the divisions mentioned above; and II, fabulistic, corresponding to the other two parts of the former division. The psychological part is represented as being devoted mainly to inner, the fabulistic to outward action.

The 'pictures' are classified, according to their contents, as dramatic, presenting only a single action, and epic, presenting a situation or a series of events. The dramatic 'pictures' are supposed to possess a greater value than the epic, and the preponderance of pictures belonging to the one or the other category is used as a test of literary merit. There are in *Iwein* fifty-one dramatic 'pictures' and twenty-eight epic 'pictures.' They are further sub-

divided into 'pure' and 'impure,' signifying that they are entirely epic or dramatic, or mixed, in that they contain elements of both categories. The several main divisions of the poem are then contrasted with regard to their relative amounts of the various kinds of 'pictures,' pure epic, pure dramatic, impure epic, impure dramatic, predominatingly epic, predominatingly dramatic. The 'pictures' are also classified as regards their length into short, medium and long, and various conclusions are drawn from the comparative number of these in the several parts.

After the discussion of the 'pictures' in their various phases the author passes to the discussion of the dramatic forms (*dramatische Formen*). The dramatic element is divided into the two main categories of lyric (monologue) and dramatic (dialogue and address), dialogue being characterized as *voll-dramatisch*, address as *halb-dramatisch*. Dialogue is further divided into 'duologue' and 'polylogue,' and all these subdivisions are treated as to number, length, and frequency in the several parts of the story. For example, part I is called *monolog-freundlich*, while II is said to be *monolog-feindlich*.

The chapter on *Figuren-Technik* is devoted to the examination of the scope and function of the various persons that appear in the poem. These are divided into two groups, main and secondary. The four main characters are the *Heldenpaar*, Iwein and Laudine, and the *Vertrautenpaar*, Gawei and Lunette. The remaining persons constitute the secondary characters. Comparisons are made as to the relative amounts of monologue, address, dialogue, duologue and polylogue that fall to the share of each of these groups of characters. For example, the *Heldenpaar* have numerically a slightly larger number of lines than the *Vertrautenpaar*. The former, however, appear twice as often, hence it is argued

"Die dramatische Bewegung der Helden ist also erregter, die der Vertrauten ruhiger. Der Wirkungskreis der Helden ist eben ein weiterer, der der Vertrauten ein engerer."

Similar contrasts are established as to Iwein and Laudine, Gawein and Lunette. One averages twenty-two lines to a scene (*Auftritt*), the other twenty-seven, hence "greater vi-

vacuity" and "greater tranquility" are respectively predicated of them.

After these and similar comparisons, made on the basis of the whole poem, the two parts, psychological and fabulistic, are examined as to the number of characters appearing in each, the relative frequency of the main and secondary characters, the length of passages, monologue, dialogue and so forth. Duologue is divided into categories: that which takes place between two main characters, between a main and a secondary character, and between two secondary characters. The two parts are also contrasted as to the frequency and length of the several kinds of dialogue.

An exhaustive resumé of the part devoted to *Iwein* is given at the close.

It will be in order now to examine some of the author's statements in detail. The work is based almost entirely on numbers and numerical relations, and yet the deductions drawn from them are often forced. Of the total number of lines on the poem, part first contains 30%, part second 38%, part third 32%, on which ratios the author, page 4, makes the following observation:

"Anfang und Ende sind also relativ knapp gehalten gegenüber der breit ausladenden Mitte, d. h. der Dichter versteht es, seinen Leser rasch in die Handlung zu verwickeln und, nachdem er ihn dann nach stark erregtem Interesse lange am behaglicher ausgeführten Mitteltheil festgehalten, wieder rasch aus der Handlung vor Erlähmung des Interesses herauszuholen."

On the next page reference is made to "die oben festgestellte Kürze dieses ersten Compositionstheiles des Gedichtes," and further on the three parts are again characterized: "erst die rasche Einführung, dann die breite Durchführung, endlich die knappere Ausführung." The above ratios of 30, 38, 32 do not, of course, justify these characterizations.

Again, on page 8, the average length of the 'pictures' is given as 103 lines. In casting about for a standard, the author arbitrarily fixes upon a measure of length for the purpose of grouping the pictures as short, medium and long. Those up to 20 lines in length are called short, those from 20 to 100 medium, and over 100 lines, long. The length of the 'pictures' ranges from 15 lines to 793, with an average of 103.

By the author's classification one of 21 lines is classed as medium, and one of 101 lines, less than the average length, is classed as long. According to this division there are 6 short, 48 medium, and 25 long. Numerous conclusions are drawn from these figures (p. 8 seqq.), conclusions that are at once found to be mistaken as soon as another norm is taken for the classification as short, medium, long. For example, if we should call those having up to 50 lines short, those from 51 to 100 medium, and over 100, long, we should get the following figures: 26 short, 28 medium, 25 long, as against 6, 48, 25, respectively, in the author's division. Again, page 26, in treating the heading "address," the division is made into short, up to 20 lines, medium, 21-30, long, 31-150, while dialogue is classed as short, up to 20 lines, medium, 21-100, and long, 101-400. In the discussion of the 'pictures' in the *Nibelungen*, page 94, the division is short, up to 20 lines, medium, 21-50, and long, 51-130, the average length being 38 lines. The arbitrariness of such divisions invalidates the deductions drawn from them. Nor do the conclusions on page 9 as to the relative number of the various 'pictures,' short, medium, and long, in Parts I and II hold, if the norm of 50-100 proposed above be substituted for that of 20-100, a classification certainly more legitimate than the one used by the author.

Similarly, the division of the poem into three parts, as well as the division into 'pictures', may be challenged. Thus in that one extending from l. 86 to l. 878, lines 259-802, where Kalogreant tells his story, clearly constitute a separate division, which in turn could be divided at ll. 397, 542, 599, 762. Again the division at l. 966 seems forced; and so in numerous other instances.

The section on the epic and dramatic elements is not convincing. While there are portions which can be classed as dramatic, and others which may be called epic, there are a large number of 'pictures' the classification of which is extremely doubtful, so much so that properly no statistics could be based upon it.

The conclusions drawn from the figures are just as fanciful as those previously mentioned: a ratio of  $1\frac{1}{2}:1$  serves as a basis for the statement: "Das dramatische Element über

wiegt und es sichert dadurch dem ganzen eine grosse Lebhaftigkeit" (p. 15).

The division into main and secondary characters is also more or less arbitrary. Other critics might distinguish two, three, five or six main characters instead of four, and in that case the whole structure so elaborately built up by the author would collapse.

By the aid of the method applied to *Iwein*, the author seeks to throw some light on the genesis of the *Nibelungenlied*. In order to gain a parallel to *Iwein*, the investigation of the *Nibelungen* is restricted to the first ten books, 1082 strophes of Lachmann's edition. This is divided into two parts, H, "Siegfried's Hochzeit," and T, "Siegfried's Tod." Each of these is further divided into sections, which, on examination, are found to correspond to Lachmann's 'books,' with the exception that Bk. iv, of Lachmann is resolved into two divisions, and Bks. vi and vii yield three of Fischer's.

The arbitray nature of the author's categories is again exemplified in this part. In *Iwein* he takes no account of the fact that Hartmann's poem is not an original piece of work, while in the *Nibelungen* all the deductions are drawn from contrasts between the work of the *Undichter* and that of the *Dichter*, in other words, between the text of MS. A and that portion of the same which Lachmann pronounced genuine. Fischer's faith in this division is so great that he speaks of "die beiden Versionen" (p. 108), as if they existed as separate texts.

Recently Braune has shown that the "Plus-strophen" of MS. B are in reality omissions of the MS. from which A descends. As these strophes occur for the most part in the portion treated by Fischer, they might have changed his ratios, had they been taken into account, especially as many of the ratios are so close that no safe conclusion could properly be drawn from them. For example, on page 104 ratios of 1:1.56 and 1:1.60 are compared: "Der Unterschied ist nur gering, aber er spricht zu Gunsten von S.<sup>1</sup>" On page 105 the author says of ratios of 1:1.67 and 1:1.60, "der Unterschied ist zwar klein, aber charakteristisch." Numerous similar instances could be cited.

The treatment of *Filostrato* and *Troilus*

und *Cryseyde* is so similar to that of *Iwein* and the *Nibelungen* that it is unnecessary to enter into details.

The whole method of judging by volume and mass seems of questionable value. While apparently concrete and objective, the basis for most of the processes is in reality subjective and even arbitrary. To characterize certain sections as epic, dramatic, predominatingly epic, predominatingly dramatic, simply by the comparative number of lines of the given type, does not commend itself as a sound method of literary criticism.

W. KURRELMAYER.

Johns Hopkins University.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### THE ANGLO-SAXON DANIEL 320-325.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—One of the most interesting of the corrupt passages in the Anglo-Saxon poem *Daniel* is that beginning with line 320 and ending with line 325. According to Grein-Wülker reading, it runs as follows:

"and seo mænigeo mære wære  
had to hebbanne swa heofonsteorran  
bebugað bradne hwyrft oð þæt brim faropæs,  
sæwaroða sand geond sealtnæ wæg  
in eare gryndeð, þæt his unrim a  
in wintra worn wurðan sceolde."

The chief difficulty with this reading is that the clause "oð þæt brim faropæs, sæwaroða sand," is not co-ordinate with the clause "heofonsteorran bebugað bradne hwyrft," as it evidently should be to bring out the meaning of the original: "Quibus locutus es, pollicens quod multiplicares semen eorum sicut stellas coeli, et sicut arenam quae est in littore maris." To obviate this difficulty, Cosijn proposes to read, in line 322, "þe bugað bradne hwyrft oððe brimfaropæs<sup>3</sup>." This gets rid of a certain awkwardness in the construction, and is, at the same time, true to the

<sup>1</sup> For the sake of convenience, the Vulgate text is here regarded as the original, though as Hofer points out—*Anglia* xii, 169—the text actually used was probably an earlier Latin translation of the Septuagint.

<sup>2</sup> *Daniel*, iii, 36 (Vulgate).

<sup>3</sup> Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, xx, 111.